

he was the first African-American dean of a primarily non-minority medical school, as well as the first African-American dean at the University of Maryland School of Medicine.

Since 1991, Dean Wilson has increased grant and contract awards from \$77 million to \$350 million. Philanthropic support for the school of medicine has risen from \$1.7 million to \$37 million. Dean Wilson has created one of the most diverse student bodies and faculties in the country, with the School of Medicine doubling the number of full-time African-American faculty. Now ranked among the top medical schools in the country, the University of Maryland School of Medicine has benefitted from Dean Wilson's leadership that has promoted the values of cultural and gender diversity and created an all-inclusive atmosphere at the medical school.

Dean Wilson's commitment to the education of minority students in the field of medicine led him to found the Association of Academic Minority Physicians. He continues to serve as editor of the association's journal. For his devotion, Dr. Wilson became the first recipient of the Association of American Medical Colleges' Herbert W. Nickens, MD Award for Diversity.

Dr. Wilson has been a good and trusted adviser to me on health care policy. He has spoken out about the need to expand research into diseases that are more prevalent in the African-American community and among women. His service on the Maryland Health Care Commission has helped to guarantee access to emergency health care for all Marylanders while ensuring that hospitals are able to provide those services.

I hope you will join me in congratulating and thanking Dean Donald E. Wilson for his outstanding contributions to medical education and his commitment to racial and cultural inclusion.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Norwood Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The Westmoreland Amendment requires the Attorney General to annually determine whether each State and political subdivision subject to the preclearance requirements of section 5 meets the requirements for bailout. The amendment further requires the Attorney General to then inform the public and each state and political subdivision that they are eligible to bail out. Last, the amendment would direct the Attorney General to consent to the bailout in federal court.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be soundly defeated. I agree with Mr. SENSENBRENNER that of all the weakening amendments offered, this one is the worst by far.

The Westmoreland Amendment turns Section 5 on its head because instead of enforcing the Voting Rights Act and stopping voting discrimination, the Department of Justice will be forced to spend nearly all of its time conducting investigations to determine where discrimination no longer exists. In the meantime, voting discrimination and constitutional violations will not be addressed.

Further, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cripple the Voting Section of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, making enforcement of the Act nearly impossible. There are nearly 900 jurisdictions covered nationwide by Section 5. Under the proposed amendment, determinations of whether a jurisdiction has a clean bill of health will require the Attorney General to dedicate considerable resources to making these determinations, and little else. This amendment has the effect of requiring coverage determinations be made by the Attorney General each year.

The Westmoreland Amendment removes the longstanding requirement that covered jurisdictions bear the burden of establishing that they are free from discrimination and places that burden on the Attorney General. Jurisdictions are uniquely positioned with the evidence showing whether or not voting discrimination is still present.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the current bailout provision in Section 4(a) of the Act provides a reasonable and cost-effective opportunity for qualifying jurisdictions to bailout any time after they meet the criteria, as eleven local jurisdictions in Virginia have already done successfully. The cost for bailout actions has averaged only \$5,000.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

WELCOMING THE NAACP TO WASHINGTON, DC ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 97TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to Washington, DC for its 97th Annual Convention. The NAACP has been dedicated to promoting and preserving civil rights since its founding in 1909. This year's theme, "Voting our Values, Valuing our Votes," reflects well the organization's commitment to the causes of equality and full participation in society for each and every American.

I wish to extend a special welcome to NAACP President and CEO Bruce Gordon who is completing his first year at the organization's helm, and to Chairman Julian Bond, who has provided steadfast direction and counsel over the years.

As a native of Baltimore, the NAACP's home, and as a life member of the organization, I am filled with pride to see such a large turnout this week in our nation's capital. I also want to welcome the delegates from Region 7, including my constituents from Maryland, who

are participating in the week's events. Many of the other delegates flew for the first time into the Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport, which was renamed last year in honor of Justice Marshall, a son of Baltimore who served as the NAACP's Chief Counsel prior to his historic tenure on the United States Supreme Court.

The 97th annual convention occurs as the House of Representatives has just overwhelmingly passed—without amendments—a 25-year reauthorization of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and we look forward to its passage this week by the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to Mr. Gordon and Mr. Bond for their vigorous efforts in support of this crucial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the NAACP for its extraordinary legacy of commitment and courage and for its outstanding presence at this 97th annual convention. I look forward to working with them to promote and protect civil rights in the years to come.

ON ILLICIT ARMS TRAFFICKING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of illegal trafficking of small arms and light weapons which is responsible for the death of approximately 1,000 people every day worldwide. As U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan reminded us in the U.N. conference on curtailing small arms and light weapons, "these weapons may be small, but they cause mass destruction."

The United States objects to any international regulation on arms trade and is opposed to a blanket ban on governments selling arms to 'non-state actors,' i.e. rebel groups, on the grounds that the oppressed have the right to defend themselves against tyrannical and genocidal governments. Unfortunately our policy also leaves the door open for terrorists groups to get their hands on weaponry. The U.S. government is loathe to sacrifice the liberty of the oppressed people worldwide in exchange for a possible security risk (terrorist threat) to the United States, but has no qualms in forfeiting the privacy and civil liberties of American citizens in return for security.

Furthermore, the United States is the leading producer of arms in the world, meaning we, more than any other country engage in arms trade with other governments, as well as 'nonstate actors.' We, as the superpower of the global system, must take the leading role in eliminating illicit arms trafficking which supplies armaments to brutal civil wars and organized crime networks and thereby causing massive casualties worldwide, everyday.

The United Nations has adopted a non-binding agreement program of action in its conference on "Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons In All Its Aspects," held in July 9–20, 2001. It encourages nations to ensure manufacturers use markings on small arms and light weapons make tracing illegal arms easier. It also encourages implementation of procedures to monitor legal sales, transfer and stockpiling of small arms and light weapons

and urges governments to make illegal manufacture, trade and possession a criminal offense.

The U.S. policy should be to support the U.N.'s Program of Action and try to make the resolution of the conference binding to the member states. We already have strict regulatory policies in arms trade within our borders. We need to expand those policies internationally with the assistance of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the RECORD, the article by Warren Hoge, titled With caveats. U.S. Backs Session at U.N. on curtailing Illegal Arms, published in the June 28, 2006 edition of the New York Times, reporting on the U.N. Small Arms & Light Weapons Review Conference 2006.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 2006]

WITH CAVEATS, U.S. BACKS SESSION AT U.N.
ON CURTAILING ILLEGAL ARMS

(By WARREN HOGE)

United Nations, June 27.—The Bush administration gave its backing on Tuesday to a United Nations conference on curtailing the international flow of illegal arms, but warned delegates against adopting measures that would restrict individual possession of weapons.

"The U.S. Constitution guarantees the rights of our citizens to keep and bear arms, and there will be no infringement of those rights," Robert G. Joseph, under secretary of state for arms control and international security affairs, told the *General Assembly*. "Many millions of American citizens enjoy hunting and the full range of firearms sports, and our work will not affect their rights," he said.

He also said Washington would object to any steps to establish international regulation of ammunition or to ban governments from selling arms to rebel groups, known in diplomatic jargon as "nonstate actors."

"While we will of course continue to oppose the acquisition of arms by terrorist groups," he said, "we recognize the rights of the oppressed to defend themselves against tyrannical and genocidal regimes and oppose a blanket ban on nonstate actors."

The two-week conference, which began Monday, is intended to improve ways of curbing the \$1 billion black market in the manufacture and distribution of small arms and light weapons that supply brutal civil wars and organized crime networks and end up killing an estimated 1,000 people every day worldwide.

Secretary General *Kofi Annan* reminded the gathering that "these weapons may be small, but they cause mass destruction." He urged member countries to toughen existing laws governing arms deals.

Steps that Mr. Joseph said the United States would support included the marking and tracing of weapons, controls on transfers, certification of the ultimate recipients, effective management of national stockpiles and destruction of illicit and government-declared surplus weapons.

Mr. Annan said the conference was not contemplating a global ban on gun ownership. "Nor do we wish to deny law-abiding citizens their right to bear arms in accordance with their national laws," he said.

He seemed to be referring to a campaign by the National Rifle Association, which has charged in mass mailings that the United Nations is plotting to take away Americans' guns through a treaty banning ownership.

John R. Bolton, the United States ambassador to the United Nations, confirmed that he had received hundreds of the form letters. Asked why all three citizen delegates from

the United States to the conference were prominent members of the gun lobby group, he said he made it a practice not to comment on the activities of nongovernmental organizations.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAU-
THORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to the King Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The King Amendment strikes, *inter alia*, section 203 of the bill. Section 203 is the part of the Voting Rights Act that provides language assistance to American citizen voters for whom English is not their first language.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be soundly defeated. I agree with the Mr. SENBRENNER that of all the weakening amendments offered, this is one of the worst and ugliest.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important things proponents of the King Amendment fail to understand is that Section 203 removes barriers to voting faced by TAX PAYING AMERICAN CITIZENS, citizens who do not speak English well enough to participate in the election process. Tax-paying citizens should not be penalized for needing assistance to exercise their fundamental right to vote.

Language minority citizens are required to pay taxes and serve in the military without regard to their level of English proficiency. If they can shoulder those burdens of citizenship, they should be able to share in the benefits of voting with appropriate assistance to exercise the vote.

Section 203 mandates language assistance based on a trigger formula for language minorities from four language groups: Native Americans, Native Alaskans, Asian Americans, and persons of Spanish heritage. Section 203 protects citizens, not illegal immigrants. Regardless of one's position on the ongoing debate over immigration reform, the debate over immigration policy is simply irrelevant to the debate on ensuring that the fundamental right to vote is exercised equally by English and non-English proficient citizens. According to the 2000 census, more than three-quarters (77 percent) of those protected by Section 203 are native-born citizens. For example, 100 percent of Native Americans and Native Alaskans were born in the United States; 98.6 percent of Puerto Ricans protected by Section 4(e) were born in the United States; and 84.2 percent of Latinos were born in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, section 203 was enacted to remedy the history of educational disparities, which have led to high illiteracy rates and low voter turnout. These disparities continue to

exist. As of 2000, three fourths of the 3 to 3.5 million students who are native-born were considered to be English Language Learners (ELLs), meaning the students don't speak English well enough to understand the basic English curriculum. ELL students lag significantly behind native-English speakers and are twice as likely to fail graduation tests. California has over 1,500,000 ELLs; Texas has 570,000 ELLs; Florida has 25,000 ELLs; and New York has over 230,000.

Since 1975, there have been more than 24 education discrimination cases filed on behalf of ELLs in 15 States. Fourteen of the States in which education discrimination lawsuits have been brought are covered by language assistance provisions. Since 1992, 10 cases have been filed. Litigation and consent decrees are currently pending in Texas, Alaska, Arizona, and Florida. Discrimination cases that have been brought address issues such as inadequate funding for ELLs, inadequate curriculum to assist ELLs become proficient in English, and lack of teachers and classrooms. These disparities increase the likelihood that ELLs will achieve lower test scores and drop out of school, ultimately, leading to lower voter registration and turnout.

Also, adults who want to learn English must endure long waiting periods to enroll in English Second Language (ESL) literacy centers. The lack of funding to expand the number of ESL centers around the country leaves minority citizens unable to enroll in classes for several years. For example, in large cities such as Boston, citizens must wait for several years to enroll. In New Mexico, citizens must wait up to a year. In the State of New York, the waiting lists were so long, the State eliminated them and instituted a lottery system. Once enrolled, learning English takes citizens several years to even obtain a fundamental understanding of the English language—not enough to understand complex ballots. Citizens should not be barred from exercising their right to vote while trying to become English proficient.

Most jurisdictions covered by Section 203 support its continued existence. According to a 2005 survey, an overwhelming majority of jurisdictions covered by Section 203 think that federal language assistance provisions should remain in effect for public elections. In fact, in a poll of registered voters, 57 percent believe it is difficult to navigate ballots and instructions and that assistance should be provided.

Mr. Chairman, it is instructive to review just a few contemporary examples which demonstrate the continuing need for the language assistance provisions of Section 203:

In 2003 in Harris County, Texas, officials did not provide language assistance for Vietnamese citizens. This prompted the Department of Justice to intervene and, as a result, voter turnout doubled and a local Vietnamese citizen was elected to a local legislative position.

The implementation of language assistance in New York City had enabled more than 100,000 Asian-Americans not fluent in English to vote. In 2001, John Liu was elected to the New York City Council, becoming the first Asian-American elected to a major legislative position in the city with the nation's largest Asian-American population.

In July 2005, the U.S. Dept. of Justice filed a lawsuit against the City of Boston for violations of the federal Voting Rights Act, specifically the language assistance provisions (Section 203) for Spanish language assistance